

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **7 February 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-25. Claims 7-12 and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claims are drawn to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-6, 13-19, 20-21 and 24-25 were allowed. Claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections.

Double Patenting Objection

Examiner objected to claim 22 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 23. Although Examiner did not also reject claims 20 and 24, Applicant notes that claims 20 and 21 and claims 24 and 25 have the same relationship as claims 22 and 23 (with different parent claims). Applicant therefore addresses the objection as if claims 20 and 24 had also been objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75.

Applicant has amended claims 21, 23, and 25 to clarify that these claims are directed at embodiments of the present invention wherein the preferred channel is comprised of **two separate unidirectional channels** (i.e., a first channel from said wireless sensor to said provisioning device and a second channel from said provisioning device to said wireless sensor). In contrast, claims 20, 22, and 24 are directed at embodiments of the present invention wherein the preferred channel is comprised of **one bidirectional channel**. No new matter has been added.

Applicant submits that claims 20-21, 22-23, and 24-25 are in condition for allowance and therefore respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objection under 37 C.F.R. 1.75.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Anthony P. Jones/
Anthony P. Jones
Registration No. 59,521

Date: 29 August 2007

Anthony Jones
Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1666
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: tony@parklegal.com